

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 324

JC 990 450

AUTHOR Nussbaum, Thomas J.  
TITLE The State of the California Community Colleges, 1998.  
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.  
PUB DATE 1998-10-01  
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Fall Leadership Conference. (Sacramento, CA, October 1, 1998).  
PUB TYPE Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Accountability; College Faculty; \*Community Colleges; \*Educational Finance; Enrollment; \*Expenditure Per Student; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Labor Force Development; Organizational Objectives; Program Budgeting; \*State Aid; Two Year Colleges  
IDENTIFIERS \*California Community Colleges

## ABSTRACT

This paper describes the extent to which California has met its three commitments for community colleges: restoring access, improving funding per student, and funding facilities needs. With regard to restoring access to higher education and workforce preparation, there was an increase in the participation rate from 58/1000 adults in California to 61/1000 (fall 1995 and fall 1998 respectively). The State is attempting to increase access and participation to 73/1000 adults by 2005. In terms of improving funding per student, the State is considerably behind: In 1995-1996 the national average of per-student funding was \$6,022 at the community college. California's community colleges were funded at \$3,533 per student in the same year. California hopes to reach \$6,500 per-student funding by 2005; however, the national average of per-student funding is projected to be over \$8,000 by 2005. The legislators approved a number of funding measures for facilities needs, which provided local and state funds for restoration, maintenance, and new facilities. A call is made for California to commit to shared governance models, increase the use of and training in technology, increase the overall budget, and successfully implement the Partnership for Excellence program. California should resolve the full-time/part-time faculty issue, recommit to diverse communities, increase transfer and program completion, increase marketing, develop more partnerships, and improve student learning and leadership development. (TGO)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

# The State of the California Community Colleges, 1998

Thomas J. Nussbaum

California Community Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TL 990 450  
ERIC  
Full Text Provided by ERIC

**The State of the California Community Colleges**  
Fall Leadership Conference, October 1, 1998  
Chancellor Thomas J. Nussbaum

**Introduction**

Thank you, member Dolphin, for that generous and affirming introduction. During your long tenure as a Board member you have not only been a great friend to the community colleges, but also a great friend to me personally. In this regard, not only I, but all those who work in or attend community colleges owe you a debt of gratitude. Thank you, Joe.

Esteemed members of the Board of Governors and local trustees; fellow chancellors, superintendents, and presidents of the colleges; valued colleagues in consultation, and dedicated staff, I am both honored and humbled to be your Chancellor. I can think of no greater cause, no greater life's work, than the responsibility to lead our community colleges in serving our people and the state. The job continues to be both immensely challenging and fulfilling--it daily tests the limits of my endurance, my abilities, my professional integrity, and even my sanity. The saving grace, the motivation that keeps bringing me back from frustration and fatigue, is the energy and passion that you, the leaders and stewards of our public trust, devote to your work. I don't ever want to let you down because I believe in you, and I believe in what we're doing together. In the big picture of things we are making major progress.

**Progress on Funding and Why We've Been Successful**

Probably the biggest sign of progress is our greatly improved funding. Indeed, the past three budget cycles have been historic successes for the California Community Colleges. We have enjoyed the three finest years ever--let me repeat, three finest years ever--in terms of funding. Incredible as it may seem, the base budget for the system has increased by over a billion dollars: a \$355 million increase in 1996-97, a \$360 million increase in 1997-98, and a \$295 million increase for 1998-99.

While the improved economy is surely a major factor contributing to improved funding, I have no doubt that we have been able to move from "good" to "great" years of funding because we have changed our message. No longer do we simply approach the Governor and the Legislature pleading that we're underfunded and that we need more money. No longer do we ask for more money to do the same things. Instead, we've begun communicating the central role that community colleges play in the social and economic success of the State--in preparing the workforce, in improving the lives of millions of our people, and in enabling a successful multicultural democracy. And, we've begun to emphasize our commitments. We specifically state what we're prepared to do differently and what we're prepared to produce, in return for an increased investment from the State. In addition, we have begun to demonstrate how we can help the State address its most pressing social and economic problems. We have tied ourselves to the public agenda.

When we came together last fall for the State of the System, I spoke of the role our colleges must play in leading the State into a major renaissance. I noted the deeply disturbing trends of the twenty year period of 1975 to 1995--a period where the State suffered major increases in poverty, incarceration, and welfare dependency, while it correspondingly allowed a deep erosion in access to its community colleges. I spoke of the "Tidal Wave II" of students coming to our doors, and how our 21st century

7C99045D

economy was creating very significant and different workforce preparation needs. Finally, I spoke of not only the stresses and strains, but also the opportunities presented by a increasingly multicultural and diverse population. For each of these challenges, we recognized the unique and central role our colleges must play. But, to meet these new challenges we had to have a plan, a vision. We needed a plan for the year 2005, and we needed a partnership with state--a combination of system and state commitments--to enable us to realize the vision.

### **The 2005 Strategic Response--Progress On What We're Asking of the State**

That plan, of course, is what we now call *The 2005 Strategic Response*. Launched by the Board early in 1997, by September of that year we had a very thorough and thoughtful product from Consultation; and in May of 1998, the Board formally adopted the policy statement.

As we begin the new academic year, it's appropriate to first assess the extent to which the State has met the three commitments we asked of it: restoring access, improving funding per student, and funding facilities needs.

**1. Restoring access:** In order to enable the State to meet the needs for postsecondary education and workforce preparation in the 21st century, community colleges must provide access to their programs and services at greatly higher levels. In the fall of 1995, 1,336,000 students attended our community colleges, and we served about 58 out of every 1000 California adults. Tragically, this "participation rate" (58/1000), represented a 25-year low, the nadir of a huge and steady erosion in access since 1975, when the participation rate was 88/1000. In the *Strategic Response*, we called for access to be restored to the level of 73/1000 by the year 2005. To do this, we called upon the State to fund enrollment growth by 4% per year.

Since 1995, the fall enrollment in the system has increased by some 140,000 to a total enrollment of 1,476,000 (fall 98 estimate). The participation rate has also moved up, increasing from 58/1000 to 61/1000. Incredible as it may seem, this three-year increase in enrollment of 140,000 students is equivalent to the *entire* undergraduate enrollment of the University of California. In terms of FTES, we have increased from 869,600 to 963,000--almost 100,000 additional full-time equivalent students, and an overall increase of 10.7% in FTES since 1995. At 963,000 FTES, this is an all-time high for the system. While this rate of enrollment growth is slightly less than the 4% per year called for in the *Strategic Response*, the State is largely meeting what we've requested it to do in restoring access.

**2. Improving funding per student:** In order to enable our colleges to provide an increased level of quality for their programs and services, funding must be at a rate significantly closer to the national average for community colleges. As of 1995-96, our colleges were funded at \$3,533 per student (credit FTES), while the national average was \$6,022 per student. In the *Strategic Response*, we committed to substantially narrow this gap so that we could overcome the compromises in quality that are unavoidable in being \$2,500 per student below the national average. Thus, we set the goal for funding our students at \$6,500 per FTES in 2005--a figure which should be within \$1,500 of the \$8,000 per student projected as the national average in 2005.

As of 1998-99, our funding per student has risen to \$4,300 per FTES, a 21.7% increase over the level of \$3,533 per FTES provided in 1995-96. In the past three budget cycles, funding has increased by almost \$800 per student. Never in the history of our colleges has there been a change of this magnitude over a similar period of years. At the same time, if we project this rate of change, and we account for

compounding and inflation, the State still will just barely meet the goal of \$6,500 per student by 2005. With all of our hard work and effective advocacy, the State has been willing to keep us relatively on target with this goal.

While the gains in funding per student are truly impressive, our efforts on the 1998-99 budget delivered an even greater breakthrough in terms of increasing general or noncategorical revenues per student. In previous years, the Governor and the Legislature provided funding increases to K-12 and the community colleges in fairly narrow and categorical areas. For instance, the additional funds have been earmarked for reducing class size, for extending the school year, for funding specific welfare reform programs, for securing instructional equipment, and for doing scheduled maintenance. With the approval of the system's "Partnership for Excellence," you will receive \$100 million in general revenue infusions on a per FTES basis. This development is even more remarkable considering that the Administration originally proposed and insisted on a funding method that would pay each district for its specific performance on specific goals. In the end, the Administration placed a new level of trust in the system because the system itself had stepped forward with a commitment and a program to improve its performance.

**3. Funding facilities needs:** In order to provide necessary facilities for the massive numbers of students who need access, the colleges must be funded for necessary capital outlay needs, and they must make maximum use of existing facilities. In the *Strategic Response* we note that the colleges have a \$4 billion backlog of capital outlay need, with an additional \$1 billion needed in 1998-99. We thus call for \$500 million per year to be provided to the colleges. In addition, we've called for additional capital outlay capacity to be provided by enabling local capital outlay bonding on the basis of a majority vote. Thanks to your hard work and the work of the other segments, we were successful in placing on the ballot a four-year bond for state funding, to provide \$200 million per segment, per year.

In terms of moving to year-round instruction, the system has been extremely responsive, and you are to be commended. In 1996-97, the average number of days in which our colleges offered instruction was 271. This number grew to 298 in 1997-98, and for 1998-99 has increased to 300 days per year. I don't know of any system, any where, that uses its facilities as much of the year as much as we do.

### **There's More To Serving Our Students Than Better Funding and Access**

As great as these accomplishments are, as much as we should celebrate these efforts and enjoy our success, I confess that I still have many sleepless nights as Chancellor. I still toss and turn because I know that truly serving our students, our communities and the State involves much more than simply increasing access and funding. I am not alone in this anguish because when I talk with you I hear the same concerns.

We worry about the people who need our services but aren't making it to our doors. We see the faces, we see lives in the balance. And we see increasing numbers who've been lost. We're serving more students, but, tragically, many are still falling through the cracks.

We worry about whether we're providing our students with what they really need, and what our greater society needs. College is not just about degrees and work; it's about preparation for life's varied aspects, including work, citizenship, and personal fulfillment. As our society evolves, the knowledge, skills, and preparation that students need in order to live meaningful lives, to be productive workers, and to be effective citizens, also change. To prepare our students for life in the 21st century, we need to provide



them with information competencies, with global competencies, and with the team concepts and problem-solving skills that come from collaborative learning and problem-based learning. We know these things, and yet in the current milieu, at least at the state government level, we seem to be overly preoccupied with degrees and work.

We worry that as Americans and Californians we are increasingly disengaging from traditional forms of civic life. We worry that our colleges need to do more to motivate our students to use their talents for the good of the larger society.

We worry about equipping our students to confront the issues of cultural pluralism. We worry about helping them see past ignorance, hate, intolerance, and fear--to appreciate the human concerns and common bonds that underlie our existence.

We worry about whether we're adequately focused on producing student learning, and not just offering courses and providing instruction. We know that excellent instruction has always been about engaged student learning. From personal experience, every excellent instructor I ever had engaged me fully and met me at least half-way in taking responsibility for learning. But, many of us worry that we have not provided enough encouragement and support for the efforts of the faculty and other academic leaders who are developing new approaches and pedagogies to produce even greater student learning.

And, perhaps most of all, many of us worry about how we're going to make the major changes we need to make when we function in a system that is more like an "Articles of Confederation" than a true system. While we have taken great strides toward unity and a common agenda, we still operate with fragmented communications, low levels of trust, and strong allegiances to our respective organizations and interest groups. We are one of the most legislatively-micromanaged higher education systems in the country; yet, many of our organizations and constituencies are reluctant to curtail this micromanagement and entrust more decisionmaking to the system and its governing board.

Our current structure of governance gives our districts and our organizations great freedom in deciding whether they want to support or resist Consultation-developed positions of the system being articulated in the Legislature. This freedom has a price, however. All-too-often it results in multiple and conflicting messages being sent to the Legislature, hardly the ideal for effective system advocacy. All-too-often it moves the system's most controversial and unresolved issues to the Legislature and Governor, again exposing weaknesses when we should be emphasizing strengths. And, perhaps even more fundamental, it tends to restrict the system to solving only those problems that the coalitions of organizations and districts are agreeable to solving.

In many ways we're trapped in an impossible situation that limits our ultimate effectiveness and success in meeting our mission. The system has a number of important and difficult issues that continue to divide us and remain unresolved. How long, for instance, have we gone around and around on such issues as: the full-time/part-time ratio, shared governance rights and responsibilities, common course numbering, the rewrite of the Education Code, and the appropriate powers of intervention of the Board of Governors and Chancellor? When we attempt to address these issues from within the system, as we should, we challenge and sap the levels of trust, communication, and unity that we have been struggling to build. It's hard on us to deal with the tough issues. On the other hand, when we don't resolve the issues, we transport them in all their difficulty and ugliness to the Legislature. We then do great damage to our common agenda, not only diverting the attention of these policy-makers from our common

message, but also asking them to take on the thankless task of adjudicating our most contentious issues.

The challenges I have just outlined, and particularly the challenge of governance, are daunting. If I did not believe so much in our common commitment to serve our students, if I did not believe so much in who we are and what we do, I would have walked away from this position. The truth of the matter is that like other no time in our history *were* achieving more unity, *were* developing greater levels of trust, and we *are* tackling the issues that have divided us. To provide a notable example, a year ago we had the difficult but essential debate about the issue of "end runs" by districts. You, voluntarily, agreed to higher levels of system behavior, and you have stuck by your commitments. Through a commitment by all of us, we have maximized our success as a system, we have maximized funding, and we've reinforced the confidence in playing by the rules.

For at least a decade, debates about shared governance and community college governance have been tearing us apart internally. Along the way, the reputation of the system has been impugned when its governance has been characterized as "dysfunctional" by the state and national media. Last year, we made a systematic commitment to stop running from these issues and deal with them. We called for a review of shared governance, we called for a review of the system's Consultation Process, and we called for a complete rewriting of the Education Code. Through these efforts, *were* engaging the dialogue about the appropriate role of the Legislature, *were* engaging the appropriate authority and responsibility of the Board of Governors and local governing boards, and *were* looking at changes to improve the effectiveness and accountability of local shared governance and Consultation.

And, just this past year, with the Partnership for Excellence, we have perhaps the best example of working together in unity when it most counts. I know that many of you and a number of our organizations were very concerned about the system embracing the concept of performance funding. Given the way the system did business in the past, the notion of moving on this concept would have been laid to rest in September of 1997, when virtually every community college organization urged the Board of Governors drop the proposal from the system's budget package. Believing that the system could fashion a reasonable program, and believing that increased funding for the system was dependent on the system being able to articulate what would happen in return for the increased investment, the Board backed my recommendation. Over the next several months, we engaged in the difficult and critical dialogue to shape the program, improving it dramatically along the way. We evolved it into a proposal that more and more organizations and districts could support--or at least not oppose. In the end, when it most counted with the Legislature, groups that could have killed the proposal moved to either support it, or at least withdraw their opposition. To my mind, this behavior demonstrates a very conscious commitment to work toward unity, to put aside differences when it most counts, and to not walk away from contentious issues.

### **The Critical Juncture: Will We Unify As A System To Better Serve Our Students?**

As we enter the 1998-99 academic year, I believe we are at a critical juncture in our history. One path leads to greatness as a system, to unparalleled service to our students, our communities and our State. To take this path we will need to further elevate our levels of trust, communication, and system consciousness; and we must be willing to withstand the kinds of trust-breaking and communication-breaking pressures that will result from our increased efforts to tackle and resolve our toughest issues. In addition, to achieve some of these resolutions, we will be faced with *voluntarily choosing* to relinquish some of our district or organizational prerogatives when necessary to support the best interests of the students, the system, and the State. The path is risky because it could also bring

major failure. Dealing with the tough issues that divide us could end up blowing apart the unity and the trust that we have gradually been able to develop. We must know when to stop or slow down when we are at the limits of continued willingness to work together in unity.

The other path is safer and certainly less stressful, but it will most probably not enable us to serve our people, our communities, and the State the way they need to be served. The other path is to essentially continue the direction the past two decades. The path will result in a basically good system that heroically struggles to provide access to quality programs and services with limited funding. We will continue to be a system that often appears weak and divided in the Legislature, and we will continue to suffer the consequences in terms of less funding and more legislative intervention. And, we will continue to be a system that leaves many of its constituencies feeling their important issues get debated and debated without ever really getting resolved.

Robert F. Kennedy once said, "Only those who dare to fail greatly can ever achieve greatly." I think his words speak to us as a system at this important point in our history. His words tell me that we must take the risky path. We must take the path that promises both greater unity and greater empowerment to control our own destiny, by working with one another as we have never worked before. However, in taking the path, we must proceed with as much care and intelligence as possible. Specifically, we must be careful to incorporate positive *system-building* or *system-reinforcing activities* into our efforts. For every issue that tears away at us, for every issue that saps and threatens our willingness to communicate and work together in unity, we need to have issues that easily unify us and reinforce our common resolve. As we examine our agenda for 1998-99 and beyond, we must carefully balance these *system-challenging* and *system-building activities*.

### **The Agenda for 1998-99**

And so, as we begin the 1998-99 academic year, as we continue to lead the social and economic renaissance for our State and its people, we must come to understand the tasks at hand. By means of the *Strategic Response*, the Board's Basic Agenda, and the system's legislative and budgetary policies, we already have much of the template in place to guide how we're proceeding. But today, as we embark on the path of greater unity and ultimate success, it is helpful to draw these pieces together into a concise statement of progress and next steps.

**1. We must maximize resources to the system so that we can continue to lead the economic and social revitalization of the State.** We've known all along that to improve our funding we must be more unified in both developing and advocating our budget needs. To enable greater unity and support for the system budget proposal, we started the earliest ever--in February--to develop the 1999-2000 system budget proposal. In addition, we specifically revised the process to provide for the input of district governing boards. Because of these improvements in process, the degree of consensus regarding the 1999-2000 proposal is the greatest I have ever seen in my twenty-two years at the system level.

The advocacy phase of the 1999-2000 system budget will challenge our unity. We will not only be working with a new Governor, but will also be dealing with a revenue picture that will probably leave the State unable or unwilling to fund the system's entire \$533 million augmentation request. In this regard, I am asking you, the leaders of the districts and the organizations, to support the overall system package, and not develop your own packages or selectively advocate your favored items. As the new Governor determines his proposed budget, we will use the Consultation Process to build unity behind system priorities and appropriate legislative strategies. In plain and simple terms, we must all resist the



temptation to abandon the collective good of the system in order to seek our own better deal with the new Governor or the new Legislature.

**2. We must successfully implement the Partnership for Excellence** So much is at stake with this major new program. As a system, we achieved a major breakthrough in trust and support when we persuaded the Governor and the Legislature to embrace the system proposal. Now, we must demonstrate that distributing the funds on a per-FTES basis and enabling the districts to work on systemwide goals, is a workable method of improving the performance of the system. By December 1st, I will meet the statutory deadline to have the system goals. In the meantime, I know you have a great need for information and technical support. As I speak, we are working on a comprehensive advisory that addresses the frequently-asked questions about the Partnership for Excellence. In addition, my staff is planning a series of workshops that can be provided around the State during the next few months.

By January, we must begin the even more complicated and challenging task of developing the contingent funding methods for what we all know as "district-specific funding." In the words of the statute, we must develop, "one or more contingent funding allocations, as well as criteria that would require the implementation of these options." This work will be difficult, and will test our unity and resolve to implement the statute. I thus will be asking the Board to allow the full calendar year for Consultation to be completed on this item.

**3. We must develop and secure passage of a comprehensive resolution to the full-time/part-time faculty issue.** I can think of no issue that divides us more in the Legislature, no issue that divides us more within the system, no issue that cries out more for resolution than the full-time/part-time faculty issue. In the two decades I have been associated with our colleges, not a year goes by when I haven't heard faculty and other groups deploring the excessive use of part-time instructors. I have heard their concerns not only about the quality of instruction, but also about the exploitation of part-timers. From administrative and trustee groups I have heard recognition of these issues, but they also cite the relative inability to respond because of the substantial underfunding of the colleges, particularly in times of recession. I have seen us try AB 1725 and program improvement, I have seen us draft and redraft our regulations, I have seen us sponsor one budget proposal after another, and still each recession erases prior gains. Every year the issue has moved into the legislative arena. Every year the issue pits one set of community college organizations against another, and, in the process, tempts each faculty group to be the most strident advocate on the issue. Every year legislators choose sides after listening to the poisonous debate. And every year we come up empty-handed.

As difficult as it may be to achieve unity on this issue, we can't afford not to. It is a matter that goes to the heart of improving the quality of education, and it is a matter that goes to the heart of our successful advocacy for funds in the Legislature. Thus, as we enter the advocacy phase of the 1999-2000 budget, and as we prepare the 1999-2000 system legislative plan, we must immediately set our sights on developing a comprehensive resolution--a united approach--for the full-time/part-time issue.

At present, we're headed for another year just like the others. We have a number of largely-disconnected attempts to address the issue. We're looking at some regulatory changes in technical areas, we're recognizing that districts can use Partnership for Excellence funds to hire new full-time faculty, and we're also requesting a \$40 million fund for "New Faculty Needs." In addition, at least one of our organizations is sponsoring bills to provide for pro-rata pay for part-timers, to provide \$50 million for New Faculty Needs, to require districts to use growth funding to hire full-timers, and to make other

changes. In my mind, this piece-by-piece, and organization-by-organization approach is a recipe for frustration and disaster. We will again be fighting in front of the Legislature, and there will be no possible the way for that body or the Governor to see any coherence in our approach.

During the next three months, we must rise to the occasion and develop a single comprehensive solution that all groups will support as the system proposal. I want to start this dialogue with my firm commitment to develop and recommend a proposal that will make significant progress on improving the full-time/part-time ratio. And, when I say we need a comprehensive proposal, I mean that we need to talk about all key aspects of the issue. For instance, we need to talk about steps to assure the quality of instruction by part-timers is comparable to that of full-timers; we need to talk about how the colleges will be able to meet their ever-expanding and changing curriculum needs; and we need to talk about how we'll reach our goals if voluntary methods aren't working.

**4. We must improve community college governance at all levels--local, system, and state.** Last year, we committed to improve our governance by initiating three major projects: a review of local shared governance, a review of the system's Consultation Process, and a project to create a new Education Code for the community colleges. As to local shared governance, we deferred the review until this fall so that the CEOs, Trustees, and the Academic Senate could develop new and expanded guidelines for implementation of the shared governance provisions. I have reviewed the most recent product of those discussions and believe it will be very useful. In addition, we have recently created the Consultation task force which will oversee the review of local shared governance, with work to be completed by spring of 1999. As to the Consultation Process, we created a task force this August, with work also to be completed by the spring of 1999.

Finally, there's the monster of them all, the Education Code rewrite project--an effort to take the 1500+ provisions of the Education Code that relate to community colleges and reduce them into a coherent, principal-driven set of rules that will enable our colleges to effectively carry out their mission in the 21st century. Yesterday, you heard about the approach for this project, along with a status report. What I want to talk about today is how pivotal this project is for our future. The Education Code rewrite is the *best vehicle* for redefining the system's relationship with the State, ~~the~~ *best vehicle* for the system to achieve more control over its own destiny and success. The very essence of the project involves moving more decisions out of the Legislature and into the hands of the system.

Like it or not, I must respect the fact a number of our organizations and districts have concerns about moving authority out of the hands of the Legislature and into the hands of the system. Sometimes it's a matter of trust, and sometimes it's a matter of preserving political influence. What we're finding from the discussions in the Education Code task force is that progress on this issue comes one inch at a time. What we're finding is that if we spend enough time on the specifics of each issue, if we try hard to communicate and understand, we can find a middle ground. The Education Code project can be a unifying and *system-building* activity if we take the time we need to process the issues. On the other hand, if we rush to meet a bill deadline, if we cut off the discussions and dictate the contents of the package, it will be a *system-challenging or system damaging* activity.

In my judgment, the system cannot possibly have a viable and comprehensive bill ready for introduction in January of 1999. Consequently, I will be working with the task force and the Board of Governors to see if there are pieces of the package that can be moved legislatively in 1999. In addition, while we complete the work in 1999, we need to generate greater awareness of this project not only within the

system, but also within the Legislature. We need to be paving the way for moving comprehensive legislation in the year 2000.

**5. We must reinvigorate our commitment to diversity** Last year we recognized the need to reaffirm our commitment to diversity, the need to reinvent and adapt our policies and practices to effectively and legally operate in a post-Proposition 209 environment. As a system we still have much work to do in bringing up the rates of success for our underrepresented populations; we also have much work to do in diversifying our staff, particularly the faculty. We proceeded not only with a policy statement, "The California Community College Commitment," but also an action plan that will give life and energy to this commitment. At its September meeting, the Board adopted the "Commitment" statement, and, by the end of the year, I am asking that Consultation complete its work on the action plan. The bottom line for me is that our goals and commitments to diversity must be factored into every decision, every program, and every initiative we undertake.

**6. We must improve the flow of our students to the four-year institutions** Tomorrow you will hear from UC President Atkinson regarding the very important memorandum of understanding (MOU) our two systems entered into last November. Our partnership to increase and facilitate the flow of our students to the University is now being implemented and monitored by a joint working group. During the past six months, I have had ongoing discussions with Chancellor Charlie Reed and Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence of the CSU system, and we are underway to develop a MOU with that system. Tomorrow, you'll be hearing from both of them regarding that initiative. In addition, I have been working with the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities to develop a similar MOU with California's private colleges and universities. In every one of these conversations, I'm pleased to report that the systems are committed to meeting or exceeding the goals for transfer that we have established in the Partnership for Excellence.

On another front, the Board of Governors and I are continuing our push for implementation of a common course numbering system. This year, the Board explicitly called for a single course numbering system for all or a subset of courses, including an implementation strategy. This issue has been another of those that has tested our unity. We must, together, make progress on this reform. In this regard, I will especially be calling on the leadership of the trustees and the CEOs to make this happen.

**7. We must tell our story better.** In last year's State of the System, I called for a systemwide public awareness and marketing campaign to enable us to better inform opinion leaders and the general public not only about the range and quality of our programs, but also about the critical role we play in the social and economic success of the State. A few months later, I asked David Viar to chair a Consultation task force established to develop this plan. The group has been meeting and is developing a report and plan which we're asking to be ready by the spring of 1999.

One fact we've known all along is that we'll need a significant source of funding for any systemwide public awareness and marketing plan that is developed. In this regard, I have been working with our new Foundation for California Community Colleges, its President Larry Toy, and the Board of Governors. Together, we'll be proposing that the new Foundation provide \$1,000,000 per year for these systemwide public awareness activities.

**8. We must infuse technology into our colleges.** It is not enough to connect our campuses to one another into a network, or simply bring the connections to the boundaries of our campuses. We must

build out the technology infrastructure, be concerned about replacing outmoded equipment, train and prepare our staff to use the technology, and ensure that we have support staff to maintain the networks and the equipment. Last year, we committed to do a "Technology Plan II" to be adopted by this coming January. This plan will provide the systemwide coordination necessary to assist the districts, and it will also help us determine and justify system budget requests for technology and telecommunications. A number of CEO leaders, including Martha Kanter, Peter MacDougall, Doug Treadway, Ed Valeau, and Jim Young, are working with us on this plan. I anticipate taking the Technology Plan II to the Board by March of 1999, so that the fiscal needs aspects can be incorporated into the system budget development process for 2000-01. In the meantime, for 1999-2000 we'll be seeking a \$21 million dollar augmentation to the current program.

**9. We must strengthen the roles community colleges play in workforce preparation and economic development.** This coming year presents us with a host of important challenges and opportunities to strengthen the role our colleges play in workforce preparation and economic development. Just this summer, new federal law was passed (the Workforce Investment Act of 1998) to consolidate a number of programs and rewrite the Job Training Partnership Act. The law calls for state and local workforce investment boards, with state governors being given significant authority. In California we'll be dealing with a new Governor, and we can expect various state agencies, including particularly the Employment Development Department, to seek the lead authority for implementing the new federal law. On the other hand, we have state legislation enacted in 1997 that calls for a "collaborative" approach to developing a state workforce preparation plan, with the key partners being: the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Secretary of Trade and Commerce, the Secretary of Health and Welfare. Consequently, I will be working aggressively to ensure that community colleges are closely involved with implementation of the new law.

An integral aspect of workforce preparation is the implementation of welfare reform. We are currently surveying the colleges regarding their efforts to work with county offices and others on the implementation of the 1997 law. As we approach 1999, it may be necessary to modify some provisions of the law or funding, and we will be equipped to do so by January.

On the economic development front, the state legislation creating the Community College Economic Development Program is scheduled to sunset in 1999, thus making reauthorization a legislative issue. During this crucial year, we are fortunate to have a Peter MacDougall as the chair of the economic development advisory committee. Peter will be working with Brice Harris, whose district now holds the ED>Net coordination grant. In addition, I have retained Jack Fujimoto, a seasoned veteran known to many of you, to assist me and my staff in providing leadership on economic development issues. Together, we expect to make major expansions and improvements to the program.

**10. We must focus on producing improved student learning.** Terry O'Banion, George Boggs, Robert Barr, John Tagg, K. Patricia Cross and many others are calling for a "paradigm shift" that would change the very definition of a college from an institution "that exists to provide instruction," to an institution "that exists to produce learning."

Russell Edgerton, in his recent, "Higher Education White Paper" (1997), describes the task as not only producing student learning, but also deciding *what learning* should be produced:

"Being better means not just offering courses and providing instruction, but taking responsibility to



produce student learning. This, in turn, entails thinking harder about the kinds of learning that students and society need in the 21st century. Simply getting more kids through the pipeline is not good enough. All constituencies relevant to higher education must aspire to help students achieve new levels of learning--learning that entails real understanding, and learning that includes the new literacies now required for our changing society, especially the literacies related to a life of engaged citizenship." (p. 62.)

As Chancellor, I would never think of regulating, controlling, imposing, or even coordinating this important dialogue. I look to the faculty and the academic leaders to take the responsibility to talk about teaching, engaged learning, and producing improved student learning. What I do want to do is encourage a serious discussion of these issues systemwide. It's terribly important that our colleges are focused on not only producing higher levels of learning, but also that the learning we're providing will equip the students to secure work, adapt, contribute to their communities, be good citizens, and lead meaningful lives. As we enter the 21st century, it's clear there are a number of new literacies our students must have, including information competency, global competency, and an understanding of diversity. It's also clear that different pedagogies (such as problem-based learning, collaborative learning, and service learning) are emerging for providing the kind of learning and skills that will be necessary in the 21st century. It is an exciting and important dialogue we need to be having, and I simply want to encourage and facilitate it.

**11. We must create programs for leadership development.** Two questions regarding leadership development increasingly haunt us: How will we secure our next generation of leaders; and how will we provide professional development and in-service training for the leaders we have? A number of our California-based doctorate and masters degree programs with focus on the community colleges have been discontinued. A number of our organizations, including ACCCA, the League, and the Academic Senate have leadership and professional development activities, but none has a comprehensive program. In addition, problems of geographic proximity, time, and money often inhibit our leaders from taking advantage of in-depth leadership development and in-service training opportunities. Having prepared and effective leaders is critical to our success as educational institutions; yet, we don't seem to be going about meeting this need in any organized way.

This July, a group of community college leaders from various organizations was convened in an informal meeting by the Accrediting Commission. We discussed the issue of leadership in the community colleges, and have agreed to work together to create a more comprehensive approach to leadership development. The program being envisioned would not just be limited to CEO development; rather, the program would embrace faculty, administrative and trustee leadership as well. This effort holds promise, and I wish to commend the Accrediting Commission and David Wolf for the initiative in bringing the parties together.

Taken together, the eleven items I've just addressed will fill all of our plates all of the year. While it's an ambitious agenda, I believe we must try for nothing less. In addition, when you study the charges more closely, you'll see that we aren't all being asked to work on every item. In fact, the division of labor in this agenda is unprecedented in our history. At the level of system policymaking and leadership, I don't believe there's ever been a time when the talent and expertise of the colleges and of the organizations has been so heavily tapped. I trust and rely on your expertise and contributions, and I know the products of your work will be superior.



And so, as I close, I remind us once again that we are at a critical juncture in our history. The risky road ahead is to increase our levels of trust, communication, and willingness to work hard for unity--to behave even more as a system and even less as a confederation of organizations and districts. Let us, together, confront our toughest issues. Let us withstand the trust-breaking and communication-breaking pressures that will result as we debate and resolve these hard issues. Let us understand that what we have in common in terms of our concerns for our students, our commitment to our mission, and our understanding of what we need to do, is far greater than what any of us or our organizations might have in common with any legislative committee, or any branch of the Administration. Let us go beyond what we've been doing in the past and reach a new level of service to our students, our communities, our system, and our State.

And so, as we go out tomorrow and start this work, I leave you this evening with two thoughts to reflect upon: one is an Ethiopian proverb, the other is from Gandhi.

The Ethiopian proverb goes, "When spider webs unite, they can tie up a lion."

And, from Gandhi, "The difference between what we do and what we are capable of doing would suffice to solve most of the world's problems."

Let's make this the greatest community college system on Earth. Thank you.

---



**U.S. Department of Education**  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



JL 990450

## **NOTICE**

### **REPRODUCTION BASIS**



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").